arXiv:1211.6373v1 [hep-ph] 27 Nov 2012

Two-loop Static QCD Potential in Heavy Quarkonia

Wayne W. Repko,[1, *] Marco D. Santia,[1, †] and Stanley F. Radford[2, ‡]

[1]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824*
[2]*Department of Physics, The College at Brockport,*
State University of New York, Brockport, NY 14420

(Dated: November 28, 2012)

We investigate the effects of including the two-loop QCD correction to the static short distance $1/r$ potential on the spectroscopy and decays in the charmonium and upsilon systems. We use a variational technique with the full two-loop corrected potential to determine a set of unperturbed trial wave functions and treat the relativistic and one-loop corrections as perturbations. This approach results in more accurate descriptions of the hyperfine splittings in both the $b\bar{b}$ and $c\bar{c}$ systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

In an earlier publication [1], two of us investigated the spectrum, leptonic widths, and electromagnetic decays of the charmonium and upsilon systems. We adopted a variational approach based on determining a set of trial wave functions derived from an unperturbed Hamiltonian consisting of a relativistic kinetic energy term, a long range confining potential and a short distance $1/r$ potential that included the one-loop QCD correction. These wave functions were then used to compute the contributions of the remaining relativistic and one-loop corrections to the short distance potential using perturbation theory. The resulting masses of the various states were then compared with a subset of the experimental values using a χ^2 test and the procedure was repeated until a χ^2 minimum was obtained.

The model in Ref. [1] yielded quite reasonable results, but there were some areas of concern. These had to do with the size of the hyperfine splittings and the values of some leptonic widths. Since both of these observables are sensitive to the values of the radial wave functions at the origin, we suspected that the trial functions, even with the inclusion of the one-loop QCD correction, were not sufficiently well determined at short distances.

To address this problem, in this paper we include both the one-loop and two-loop corrections to the short distance $1/r$ potential in the unperturbed Hamiltonian. For the full static QCD potential to two-loops, we use the results of Ref [2]. The two-loop derivation was performed using the $\overline{MS}$ renormalization scheme. As discussed below, the use of the $\overline{MS}$ scheme requires a slight modification to our one-loop perturbative potential. With this modification, we can then repeat the variational calculation previously mentioned.

In Sec. 2, we discuss the modifications of the perturbative potential associated with changing it to the $\overline{MS}$ renormalization scheme and, in Sec. 3, we present the results for the charmonium and upsilon systems. Our conclusions are contained in Sec. 4. Several calculational details are presented in the Appendices.

2. MODIFIED SEMIRELATIVISTIC MODEL

We use a semi-relativistic unperturbed Hamiltonian of the form

$$H_0 = 2m\sqrt{\vec{p}^{\,2} + m^2} + Ar + V(r)\,, \tag{1}$$

---

[*] Electronic address: repko@pa.msu.edu
[†] Electronic address: santiama@msu.edu
[‡] Electronic address: sradford@brockport.edu

where $V(r)$ is the two-loop QCD short-range static potential [2]. It is calculated in full detail in Appendix A and is

$$\begin{aligned} V(r) &= -\frac{4}{3}\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{r}\left[1+\left(31-\frac{10}{3}n_f\right)\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{12\pi}+\left(11-\frac{2}{3}n_f\right)\left(\ln(\mu r)+\gamma\right)\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{2\pi}\right. \\ &\quad +\left(11-\frac{2}{3}n_f\right)^2\left(\left(\ln(\mu r)+\gamma\right)^2+\frac{\pi^2}{12}\right)\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S^2}{4\pi^2} \\ &\quad +\left(102-\frac{38}{3}n_f+\frac{2}{3}\left(31-\frac{10}{3}n_f\right)\left(11-\frac{2}{3}n_f\right)\right)\left(\ln(\mu r)+\gamma\right)\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S^2}{8\pi^2} \\ &\quad \left.+\left(\frac{4343}{18}+36\pi^2-\frac{9\pi^4}{4}+66\,\zeta(3)-\left(\frac{1229}{27}+\frac{52\,\zeta(3)}{3}\right)n_f+\frac{100}{81}n_f^2\right)\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S^2}{16\pi^2}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where μ is the renormalization scale and n_f denotes the number of light quarks. The perturbative potential has the form

$$H' = V_L + V_S\,. \tag{3}$$

Here, V_L is the order v^2/c^2 correction to the confining potential,

$$V_L = -\frac{A}{2m^2 r}\vec{L}\cdot\vec{S}\,. \tag{4}$$

The short distance potential V_S [3–5],

$$V_S = V_{HF} + V_{LS} + V_T + V_{SI}\,, \tag{5}$$

must be modified in order to be consistent with the two-loop QCD static potential $V(r)$. This amounts to changing the renormalization scheme from the Gupta-Radford version [6] used in [1] to the $\overline{MS}$ version used in obtaining $V(r)$. The transformation between the α_S used in [1] and $\bar{\alpha}_S$ is given by

$$\alpha_S = \bar{\alpha}_S[1+\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{4\pi}(\frac{49}{3}-\frac{10}{9}n_f)]\,. \tag{6}$$

From this relationship we now can write down the modified short distance potential.

$$\begin{aligned} V_{HF} &= \frac{32\pi\bar{\alpha}_S\vec{S}_1\cdot\vec{S}_2}{9m^2}\left\{\left[1+\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{4\pi}(\frac{23}{3}-\frac{10n_f}{9}-3\ln 2)\right]\delta(\vec{r})-\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{24\pi^2}(33-2n_f)\nabla^2\left[\frac{\ln\mu r+\gamma_E}{r}\right]\right. \\ &\quad \left.+\frac{21\bar{\alpha}_S}{16\pi^2}\nabla^2\left[\frac{\ln mr+\gamma_E}{r}\right]\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

$$V_{LS} = \frac{2\bar{\alpha}_S L\cdot S}{m^2 r^3}\left\{1+\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{4\pi}\left(\frac{125}{9}-\frac{10n_f}{9}+\frac{2}{3}\Big[(33-2n_f)(\ln(\mu r)+\gamma_E-1)-12(\ln mr+\gamma_E-1)\Big]\right)\right\} \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{aligned} V_T &= \frac{4\bar{\alpha}_S(3\vec{S}_1\cdot\hat{r}\vec{S}_2\cdot\hat{r}-\vec{S}_1\cdot\vec{S}_2)}{3m^2r^3}\left\{1+\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{4\pi}\left(\frac{65}{3}-\frac{10n_f}{9}+\frac{2}{3}\left[(33-2n_f)\left(\ln\mu r+\gamma_E-\frac{4}{3}\right)\right.\right.\right. \\ &\quad \left.\left.\left.-18\left(\ln mr+\gamma_E-\frac{4}{3}\right)\right]\right)\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

$$V_{SI} = \frac{4\pi\bar{\alpha}_S}{3m^2}\left\{\left[1+\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{4\pi}(\frac{43}{3}-\frac{10n_f}{9}-2\ln 2)\right]\delta(\vec{r})-\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{24\pi^2}(33-2n_f)\nabla^2\left[\frac{\ln\mu r+\gamma_E}{r}\right]-\frac{7\bar{\alpha}_S m}{6\pi r^2}\right\} \tag{10}$$

3. RESULTS

Although we are treating V_L and V_S perturbatively, we will retain the δ-functions in V_{HF} and V_{SI} rather than taking the usual approach of 'softening' them by using a sharply peaked, differentiable function. This is a departure from [1]. However, with the modified H_0, we found that the softened δ-function offered no substantial improvement to the overall $c\bar{c}$ and $b\bar{b}$ spectra, and had the disadvantage that it predicts a considerably smaller $\Upsilon(1S)-\eta_b(1S)$ hyperfine splitting than the one observed [7–9] along with a less successful description of the leptonic widths. The final parameters that resulted from the variational calculation are shown in Table I.

	$c\bar{c}$	$b\bar{b}$
A (GeV^2)	0.149	0.168
$\bar{\alpha}_S$	0.304	0.213
m_q (GeV)	1.69	5.03
μ (GeV)	1.95	8.36

TABLE I: Fitted Parameters for the $c\bar{c}$ and $b\bar{b}$ systems

3.1. Charmonium System

The results for the spectrum of the charmonium system are shown in Table II. We set n_f to 4 for the calculations. The description of the $c\bar{c}$ spectrum with the modified non-perturbative wave functions and the retention of the δ-functions in the perturbation is consistent with our earlier calculations [1]. The result of 116.7 MeV for $J/\psi(1S) - \eta_C(1S)$ splitting compares favorably with the 116.6 ± 1.2 MeV experimental value. The corresponding $\psi(2S) - \eta_C(2S)$ result of 87.6 MeV remains significantly larger than the experimental value of 48.1 ± 4.0 MeV. On the other hand, the two-loop unperturbed wave functions provide a much better description of the leptonic widths, shown in Table III. The dipole decay rates, which depend on the matrix elements of r, are not particularly affected by the changes in the short distance behavior associated with the inclusion of the two-loop corrections.

$m_{c\bar{c}}$ (MeV)	Theory	Expt
$\eta_c(1S)^*$	2978.7	2980.4 ± 1.2
$J/\psi(1S)^*$	3095.5	3096.916 ± 0.011
$\chi_{c\,0}(1P)^*$	3419.4	3414.74 ± 0.35
$\chi_{c\,1}(1P)^*$	3505.9	3510.77 ± 0.07
$\chi_{c\,2}(1P)^*$	3556.2	3556.20 ± 0.09
$h_c(1P)$	3525.9	3525.93 ± 0.27
$\eta_c(2S)$	3603.2	3638.0 ± 4.0
$\psi(2S)^*$	3690.9	3686.093 ± 0.034
$\psi(1D)$	3802.2	3771.1 ± 2.4
1^3D_2	3821.4	
1^3D_3	3831.0	
1^1D_2	3822.5	
$\chi_{c\,0}(2P)$	3843.6	
$\chi_{c\,1}(2P)$	3928.1	
$\chi_{c\,2}(2P)$	3978.9	3929.0 ± 5.4
$h_c(2P)$	3948.6	
$\eta_c(3S)$	4006.9	
$\psi(3S)$	4087.8	4039.0 ± 1.0
$\psi(2D)^*$	4148.0	4153.0 ± 3.0
2^3D_2	4170.5	
2^3D_3	4184.0	
2^1D_2	4172.8	

TABLE II: Results for the $c\bar{c}$ spectrum are shown. The states denoted by a * are used in the fitting procedure. In order to account higher order corrections, we used a 2.5 MeV error offset in the fit. All data is taken from [10].

$\Gamma_{e\bar{e}}$ (keV)	Theory	Expt
$\psi(1S)$	5.47	5.55 ± 0.14
$\psi(2S)$	2.80	2.48 ± 0.06
$\psi(3S)$	2.00	0.86 ± 0.07
$\psi(1D)$	0.14	0.242 ± 0.030

TABLE III: Leptonic widths of the $\psi(nS)$ and the $\psi(1D)$ states are shown. The $\psi(nS)$ widths include the QCD correction factor $(1 - 16\pi\bar{\alpha}_S/3)$.

3.2. Upsilon System

The results for the $b\bar{b}$ spectrum, computed using $n_f = 5$, are shown in Table V. For the levels that are not particularly sensitive to the short distance behavior wave functions, the results are compatible with Ref. [1]. The main improvement is seen in the $\Upsilon(1S) - \eta_b(1S)$ hyperfine interval [11–13], which has increased from 47.0 MeV to 67.4 MeV, much closer to experimental value of 69.5 ± 3.2 MeV. The $2S$ and $3S$ hyperfine intervals are also larger than those in [1]. Our calculation is also consistent with the recent discovery of evidence for a 3^3P_J multiplet from the ATLAS detector [14–18]. The leptonic widths are given in Table IV.

$\Gamma_{e\bar{e}}$ (keV)	Theory	Expt
$\Upsilon(1S)$	1.340	1.340 ± 0.018
$\Upsilon(2S)$	0.644	0.612 ± 0.011
$\Upsilon(3S)$	0.486	0.443 ± 0.008
$\Upsilon(4S)$	0.444	0.272 ± 0.029

TABLE IV: Leptonic widths of the $\Upsilon(nS)$ states are shown. The $\psi(nS)$ widths include the QCD correction factor $(1 - 16\pi\bar{\alpha}_S/3)$

4. CONCLUSIONS

The inclusion of the two-loop corrections to the short distance static potential used in the determination of the unperturbed trial wave functions improves description of $c\bar{c}$ and $b\bar{b}$ observables that are sensitive to the behavior of the wave function near $r \to 0$. This enabled us to retain the δ-function terms in the perturbative potential and account for the larger ground state hyperfine splittings in both the charm and upsilon systems. These improvements can be obtained without a dramatic change in the descriptions of the overall $c\bar{c}$ and $b\bar{b}$ spectra.

Appendix A: Two-loop short distance potential calculational details

The momentum space version of the two-loop short distance potential, $V(\vec{k}^2)$, in terms of $\overline{\alpha}_S$ is given in the paper by Y. Schröder [2] using the $\overline{MS}$ renormalization scheme. In order to calculate the coordinate space potential, $V(r)$, it is necessary to evaluate integrals of the form

$$I_n(r) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int d^3k \, \frac{\ln^n(\vec{k}^2/\mu^2)}{\vec{k}^2} \, e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{r}} \tag{A1}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi^2 r} \int_0^\infty dx \frac{2^n \ln^n(x)}{x} \sin(\mu r x) \, . \tag{A2}$$

$m_{b\bar{b}}$ (MeV)	Theory	Expt
$\eta_b(1S)$	9391.5	9390.8 ± 3.2
$\Upsilon(1S)^*$	9459.0	9460.30 ± 0.26
$\chi_{b\,0}(1P)^*$	9865.7	9859.44 ± 0.52
$\chi_{b\,1}(1P)^*$	9892.7	9892.78 ± 0.40
$\chi_{b\,2}(1P)^*$	9910.9	9912.21 ± 0.40
$h_b(1P)$	9900.2	
$\eta_b(2S)$	9984.6	
$\Upsilon(2S)^*$	10021.3	10023.26 ± 0.31
$\Upsilon(1D)$	10151.1	
$1^3D_2^*$	10157.2	10161.1 ± 1.7
1^3D_3	10161.5	
1^1D_2	10158.1	
$\chi_{b\,0}(2P)^*$	10231.3	10232.5 ± 0.6
$\chi_{b\,1}(2P)^*$	10253.8	10255.46 ± 0.55
$\chi_{b\,2}(2P)^*$	10269.1	10268.65 ± 0.55
$h_b(2P)$	10260.2	
1^3F_2	10352.9	
1^3F_3	10354.7	
1^3F_4	10355.2	
1^1F_3	10354.5	
$\eta_b(3S)$	10331.8	
$\Upsilon(3S)^*$	10361.2	10355.2 ± 0.5
$\Upsilon(2D)$	10442.2	
$\chi_{b\,0}(3P)$	10513.7	
$\chi_{b\,1}(3P)$	10534.4	
$\chi_{b\,2}(3P)$	10548.7	
$\langle 3^3P_J \rangle$	10540.0	10530 ± 10.3

TABLE V: Results for the $b\bar{b}$ spectrum are shown. The states denoted by a * are used in the fitting procedure. In order to account higher order corrections, we used a 2.5 MeV error offset in the fit. All data taken from [10]. The notation $\langle 3^3P_J \rangle$ denotes the spin average of the 3^3P_J levels.

The latter integral is readily evaluated using Mathematica for the values $n = 0, 1, 2$ that are needed to obtain $V(r)$. Explicitly, the expression for $V(\vec{k}^2)$ is [2]

$$V(\vec{k}^2) = -\frac{4}{3}\frac{4\pi}{\vec{k}^2}\overline{\alpha}_S\left[1 + \frac{\overline{\alpha}_S}{4\pi}c_1(\vec{k}^2/\mu^2) + \frac{\overline{\alpha}_S^2}{16\pi^2}c_2(\vec{k}^2/\mu^2)\right]\,, \tag{A3}$$

where $c_1(x)$ and $c_2(x)$ are given by [19].

$$c_1(x) = a_1 - \beta_0 \ln(x) \tag{A4}$$

$$c_2(x) = a_2 + \beta_0^2 \ln^2(x) - (\beta_1 + 2\beta_0\, a_1) \ln(x)\,. \tag{A5}$$

The parameters a_1, a_2, β_0 and β_1 are given in [2]

Putting everything together and doing some simplification, the short distance potential to the two-loop order is

$$\begin{aligned} V(r) \;=\; & -\frac{4}{3}\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{r}\left[1+\left(31-\frac{10}{3}n_f\right)\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{12\pi}+\left(11-\frac{2}{3}n_f\right)\Big(\ln(\mu r)+\gamma\Big)\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S}{2\pi}\right. \\ & +\left(11-\frac{2}{3}n_f\right)^2\left(\Big(\ln(\mu r)+\gamma\Big)^2+\frac{\pi^2}{12}\right)\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S^2}{4\pi^2} \\ & +\left(102-\frac{38}{3}n_f+\frac{2}{3}\left(31-\frac{10}{3}n_f\right)\left(11-\frac{2}{3}n_f\right)\right)\Big(\ln(\mu r)+\gamma\Big)\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S^2}{8\pi^2} \\ & \left.+\left(\frac{4343}{18}+36\pi^2-\frac{9\pi^4}{4}+66\,\zeta(3)-\left(\frac{1229}{27}+\frac{52\,\zeta(3)}{3}\right)n_f+\frac{100}{81}n_f^2\right)\frac{\bar{\alpha}_S^2}{16\pi^2}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{A6}$$

It is interesting to note that the leading log terms to second order would sum to

$$\frac{1}{1-(33-2n_f)(\ln(\mu r)+\gamma)\overline{\alpha}_S/6\pi}\,, \tag{A7}$$

and that the sub-leading log term can be written

$$\frac{(31-10n_f/3)\overline{\alpha}_S/12\pi}{1-(33-2n_f)(\ln(\mu r)+\gamma)\overline{\alpha}_S/3\pi}\,. \tag{A8}$$

As expected, as μr gets small the log term becomes positive and increasingly large thereby softening the potential.

Appendix B: Calculational Details

In the determining the trial wave functions, we use a variational approach as described in [1]. The trial function is given by

$$\psi^m_{j\ell s}(\vec{r}) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} C_k\,(r/R)^{k+\ell}\,e^{-r/R}\mathcal{Y}^m_{j\ell s}(\Omega)\,. \tag{B1}$$

In the determining of the matrix elements using this trial function and the potential given in Eq. (A6), it is worth noting that a special type of polygamma function had to be used. The second order logarithmic term of the potential when integrated results in an integral of the form

$$\int_0^\infty t^{z-1}e^{-t}\ln^2(t)dt = \Gamma(z)(\Psi^{(0)}(z)^2+\Psi^{(1)}(z))\,, \tag{B2}$$

where $\Psi^{(n)}(z)$ represents a polygamma function of order n. In our case we encountered both the digamma and trigamma functions.

---

[1] S. F. Radford and W. W. Repko, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 074031 (2007)
[2] Y .Schröder, Phys. Lett. B **447**, 321 (1999).
[3] S. N. Gupta and S. F. Radford, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 2309 (1981); S. N. Gupta and S. F. Radford, Phys. Rev. D **25**, 3430 (1982).
[4] W. Buchmuller, Y. J. Ng and S. H. H. Tye, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 3003 (1981).
[5] S. N. Gupta, S. F. Radford and W. W. Repko, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 3305 (1982).
[6] S. N. Gupta and S. F. Radford, Phys. Rev. D **25**, 2690 (1982).
[7] B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 071801 (2008); **102**, 029901(E) (2009).
[8] B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 161801 (2009).
[9] G. Bonvicini *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **81**, 031104(R) (2010).
[10] J. Beringer *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012) (URL:http://pdg.lbl.gov). [17]
[11] S. F. Radford and W. W. Repko, Nucl. Phys. A **865**, 69 (2011) [arXiv:0912.2259 [hep-ph]].

[12] S. Meinel, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 114502 (2010) [arXiv:1007.3966 [hep-lat]].
[13] R. Giachetti and E. Sorace, arXiv:1207.3301 [hep-ph].
[14] The ATLAS collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 152001 (2012), [arXiv:1112.5154 [hep-ex]].
[15] W. Kwong and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 279 (1988).
[16] L. Moytka and K. Zaleski, Eur. Phys. J. C **4**, 107 (1998).
[17] S. F. Radford and W. W. Repko, arXiv:1201.4096 [hep-ph].
[18] C. O. Dib and N. Neill, arXiv:1208.2186 [hep-ph].
[19] Note the changes in the sign of the $\ln(x)$ terms to conform with using $\vec{k}^2/\mu^2$.